

I'm a reporter for the news outlet Inside EPA. I was wondering if I could get an update from you on the Hunters Point cleanup and review/re-look at falsified data issues.

Could you tell me if the Navy and EPA have corresponded in the last 3 months on the issues over cleanup and the reexamination of the site given the falsified data that was used there? Are there any current disagreements between EPA and the Navy over these? If there is correspondence, could I obtain copies of it?

- A. The Navy and EPA has also corresponded over the last 3 months on the reexamination of the site given the falsified data. On December 28, 2018, EPA sent the Navy two letters with comments on its *Building Radiation Survey Data Initial Evaluation Report* and the *Draft Radiological Data Evaluation Findings Report for Parcel C Soil*. Those letters can be found at: [HYPERLINK "<https://semspub.epa.gov/work/09/100016259.pdf>"] and [HYPERLINK "<https://semspub.epa.gov/work/09/100016258.pdf>"].

Commented [LL1]: Nothing wrong with this, just probably not necessary.

EPA has also corresponded with written to the Navy about finalizing its *Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan (Work Plan)*. This *Work Plan* is a reexamination of the areas in Parcel G where Tetra Tech EC Inc conducted previous radiological work. The Navy will test and clean up, if necessary, soil and current, onsite buildings in Parcel G. Once Parcel G rework is complete, the Navy will begin this reexamination do rework on other Parcels impacted by previous Tetra Tech EC Inc radiological work. On December 13, 2018, EPA sent the Navy additional comments on its *Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan*. That letter can be found at: <https://semspub.epa.gov/work/09/100016258.pdf>.

Commented [LL2]: The Navy might start the next parcel(s) before finishing Parcel G, if logistics work out for doing so.

Commented [LL3]: Tetra Tech's various subsidiaries have also done non-rad work at the site, so I try to specify rad work to be more precise.

On March 27, 2019, EPA responded to a letter from the Navy dated March 15, 2019, about the process for addressing the site's *Five-Year Review* and the *Work Plan*. Our letter outlined the approach for the Navy's statement to pursue the use of RESRAD family of codes, a tool maintained by the Department of Energy, in lieu of the PRG Calculator. We also requested a meeting with the Navy to further discuss, which was held the morning of April 15, 2019. Our letter will be posted to the EPA's Hunters Point Naval Shipyard website soon. Please reach out to contact Bill Franklin (XXX-XXX-XXXX) with the Navy for them to provide their letter.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Commented [LL4]: I don't feel strongly, but I do feel the letters speak for themselves, so it's not necessary for us to go into this level of detail. She can read it herself.

On April 11, 2019, EPA sent the Navy a letter that which outlined a proposed path forward for these two documents. Specifically, it outlines a path forward to finalize the *Parcel G Work Plan* in phases to strategically move forward with the field rework in a manner that is transparent to the public and allows for public comment. The above Our proposed path forward letter will be posted to the EPA's Hunters Point Naval Shipyard website soon.

Commented [LL5]: That vs which – Use that when the clause limits the thing it is describing (it's only this one particular letter). Use "which" if it does not limit/define what it's describing, e.g. "a letter, which was signed by Enrique,"

In the fall, your predecessor, Nahal Mogharabi, told me in an email response to questions that the Navy was in the process of evaluating existing radiological cleanup standards using the current EPA PRG Calculator. Could you tell me if the Navy has gotten back to you on this evaluation?

- A. The Navy is doing its *Five-Year Review* of Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. This important, routine process will assess whether current remedies and remedial goals documented in the Records of Decision (RODs) still protect human health and the environment. EPA's Preliminary Remedial Goal

(PRG) Calculator is a tool to assess the protectiveness of current remedies that is consistent with long-established Superfund regulations and guidance.

We expect that Navy to use the PRG Calculator to complete ~~its~~^{its} *Five-Year Review* report. On September 21, 2018, we sent the Navy comments on ~~its~~^{its} *July 9, 2018, draft Five-Year Review* report, which ~~did not include~~^{included} draft PRG Calculator assessments. That letter can be found ~~here~~^{here}: [HYPERLINK "https://semspub.epa.gov/work/09/100010568.pdf"]. Since then, we have had deliberative, staff-level discussions with the Navy about ~~its~~^{its} *draft PRG Calculator assessments for onsite soil and buildings*. When the Navy ~~revises~~^{provides} its draft conclusions on the PRG Calculator assessments, EPA and other regulatory agencies will provide review and comments regarding the acceptability of the assessment.

~~On March 27, 2019, EPA responded to a short letter from the Navy dated March 15, 2019. EPA's April 11, 2019, proposed path forward letter to the Navy also addresses a proposed path forward on the forthcoming Five-Year Review report for the site. Our letters outlined the approach for the Navy's statement to pursue the use of RESRAD family of codes, a tool maintained by the Department of Energy, in lieu of the PRG Calculator. We also requested a meeting with the Navy to further discuss, which was held the morning of April 15, 2019. Our letters will be posted to the EPA's Hunters Point Naval Shipyard website soon.~~

We recommend that you ~~contact~~^{reach out to} the Navy regarding Navy letters and about your questions ~~about~~^{on} ~~its~~^{its} PRG Calculator assessments.

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0"